

INFORMATION LETTER

Not for
Publication

NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

For Members
Only

No. 1538

Washington, D. C.

May 28, 1955

National Radio Show Features Canned Foods

On Saturday, May 28, the show "This Week in Washington" featured canned food as a part of the program, when Jack Hamilton interviewed Katherine R. Smith, Director of the N.C.A. Consumer Service Division.

The program is produced by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and is a public service feature made available to the American Broadcasting Company radio network. Approximately 150 ABC stations carry the show.

In addition, material from the ABC show is excerpted, put in a different format, and sent to 55 local chambers of commerce across the country, where it is broadcast on local stations. This program is called "Report from Washington." In all, the N.C.A. feature will have been broadcast in approximately 200 towns and cities.

The May 28 program was tape-recorded in the N.C.A. test kitchens. Ken Goddard, director of radio and television for the National Chamber of Commerce, and Jack H. Hamilton, radio-TV editor (son of the late Howard Hamilton of American Can Company) produced the show, with Mr. Hamilton interviewing Miss Smith.

Drosophila Control

A special bulletin on *Drosophila Control*, based on special field work and careful observations made during 1954, has been prepared by the Special N.C.A. Committee on Tomato Products Sanitation and its entomological advisers and N.C.A. staff.

This first bulletin of the current season contains recommendations for canners and their growers for reducing the infestation of these insects in the tomato fields and for eliminating the depositing of eggs in the fruits while they are still in the field.

An additional communication, covering suggestions and recommendations for sanitation and control methods at receiving stations and at canning plants, will be issued by the Committee later in the season.

Directors Give Attention to Canners' Relationship with Agriculture

Emphasis at the spring meeting of the N.C.A. Board of Directors was placed on the desirability of a close working relationship between canner and grower and between the Association and the farm groups. The morning session on May 20 was devoted almost exclusively to topics in this area. As stated by President George B. Morrill, Jr.:

"Our canning industry is closely related to agriculture. In fact, it might be said that it is an integral part of the great agricultural industry, since it performs the marketing function of converting perishable farm crops into nonperishable canned food. It necessarily follows, therefore, that the farmer who grows the food crop, whether it be fruit or vegetable, and the canner who, by processing these perishables, thus extending the marketing season almost indefinitely, have a great deal in common. In fact, their economic interests are so intertwined that it is frequently difficult to think of them as two separate groups.

"Certainly, insofar as the flow of the raw product from farm to factory to consumer is concerned, it cannot be said that there is any termination of this marketing problem at any point along the line until it ultimately reaches the consumer. There is no one who appreciates more than the canners and farmers themselves how closely their economic welfare is intertwined. Consequently those groups who represent the farmer's interests and speak for him cannot separate themselves from the interests of the canner as well, and by the same token the National Canners Association, which is committed to the interests of the canner and his welfare, is vitally concerned with the interests of those farmers who grow crops for canning."

This kinship of canner and grower relations was presented by a trio of speakers consisting of Paul Benson of public relations counsel for the Green Giant Company, who presented the case from the public relations point of view; R. H. Winters of The Larsen Company, from the canner's viewpoint; and Lee Towson, past president of the Vegetable Growers Association of America, from the grower's standpoint. Following their presentations George Anderson of the Dudley-Anderson-Yutzky firm, working with the current N.C.A. Consumer and Trade Relations program, showed how this program is being pointed toward publicity accentuating canner-grower relations.

And finally the luncheon speaker, Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation,

in an inspiring address, gave ample stress to the important relationship between growers and canners. All of the papers on this subject are reproduced in this issue of the INFORMATION LETTER starting at page 220.

In other portions of the Friday program Secretary Carlos Campbell reviewed the Association's financial report covering the 1955 budget as of April 30, 1955. Expenditures to date totaling \$353,616.84 as against the 1955 total budget of \$1,320,360 were slightly less than the 1954 expenditures for the equivalent period of \$368,372.80.

The Board voted to elect Milton E. Brooding of the California Packing Corporation and Charles S. Bridges

(Please turn to page 220)

Meeting of N.C.A. Directors

(Concluded from page 219)

of Libby, McNeill & Libby to vacancies on the Executive Committee.

Secretary Campbell reported on the recent nuclear tests of canned foods; C. A. Greenleaf, Associate Director of the Washington Research Laboratory, delivered a report on the "Current Status of Cold Sterilization"; and the film "Science in Action" was shown. This film was a recent TV program in San Francisco which detailed the scientific basis of canning, utilizing dialog participated in by Dr. Ira Somers of the Western Branch Laboratory and shots made in that laboratory and in the industry canneries.

Just prior to adjournment President Morrill reported that in recognition of the considerable amount of interest in holding an N.C.A. Convention in Miami Beach a poll had been conducted and had revealed a major desire on the part of members to try a new city, but that lack of sufficient exhibit space in Miami Beach as well as unfavorable available dates acted against a decision to go there in 1957, leaving the status of the 1957 Convention unchanged from the previous resolution of the Board to alternate between Atlantic City and Chicago.

Mr. Morrill reported also that in 1959 Miami Beach would have facilities for the exhibit and more desirable available dates, possibly the period January 11 to 18. Accordingly, the Association has taken the privilege of first refusal, without binding commitment.

Theme of the first session of the Board held on Thursday afternoon, May 10, was "How the Association Protects the Reputation of Canned Foods." Past President Howard T. Cumming acted as master of ceremonies. He said among other things that such protection is the major responsibility of the Association to the canning industry, and that the Association carries out this responsibility in three principal areas:

- (1) Scientific aid to canners to insure proper processing (through the laboratory services).
- (2) Preventing insofar as possible the spread of derogatory statements about canned foods (principally the work of the Information Division).
- (3) A vigorous defense of unwarranted claims against canned foods (Claims Division services).

Mr. Cumming's introduction was followed by a presentation of the work in defense of unwarranted claims done in the form of a dramatic skit organized by chief counsel H. Thomas Austern.

cessful very quickly—a very scrutinizing public whose wishes must be adhered to. Their desires must be considered carefully.

Our supplier-public is another very important group—not only suppliers of cans, boxes, etc., but also those on a community-basis whose services you must employ. The canning industry is working with a perishable product and everything must go smoothly during the time of operation.

Our government-public—not just the government controlling the country but the state and local people who sometimes become keenly interested in our operations.

Our trade-public plays a very important part in our success.

Our competitor-public, of which there is a large number. One of the finest publics, symbolized in meetings of this kind.

This is a breakdown of the people we have to work with. Consider how these groups measure us. They are very critical. How do these folks look at your company? First of all, I think everyone will agree they will measure you by the kind of people you are and have working for you. Are they sincerely and honestly interested? Do they do a good job?

The next thing in order is the adoption of a long-range company policy of operation. It must be mutually beneficial, something that shows interest in the community, neighbors, etc. It must be honestly administered. Without those qualifications you will encounter trouble of one kind or another. Your public will measure you by your actions. You cannot say one thing and do something else. Your actions must be geared to the interests of your community.

Another way in which your community will measure you is by your products or services. Whether you are a success or failure depends on whether your company is a real asset to the community and renders real service to them. The community-public is also representative of other publics mentioned. Many of the folks we work with will be in one or more public.

What is public relations?

There are many definitions and all of them are applicable, but I really believe there is one that is simple: Public relations just means doing good. What I mean by doing good is putting your best foot forward at all times. Very often you hear people say that if you do good you will get credit. Very often that is not true for the reason that you have failed to take the second step—that is, to communicate. Public relations is actually doing good and communicating it to your public, your friends, neighbors, etc. It is not enough just to tell them but to be sure they understand what you are telling them. Time and time again we have become aware of the

Canner-Grower Relations from the Public Relations Point of View

By Paul Benson,
Green Giant Company

Actually public relations is so simple that it is something everybody has whether he likes it or not, and whether he wants to be good or bad in his public relations is the difference between success and failure. If you don't have good public relations, it is indicative you are a failure; good public relations are paramount to success.

Let's consider the canner-community aspect of public relations. If we cannot be considered to have good public relations in our plant community, we cannot be considered a success elsewhere.

What are the functions of the canner? One of his first functions is with those who grow the crops and where he gets to know a large number of people. In dealing with these people you have opportunity to create a good attitude toward yourself and your company.

In the processing plant you work with another large group toward creating good will.

Distributing the product to the consumer is another function in which you meet large numbers of people. In each of these contacts you have to spread good will for your company. I am sure that if you would figure out how many contacts you make and multiply by the good will built up in each contact, you will have gone a long way toward being a success in your enterprise.

Who are your publics? They are the various groups you have to work with. One of the most important is employees. They are your public relations ambassadors—they spread your story to friends and neighbors. They are the front line people who are selling your company all the time.

Another important public is your stockholders, who see fit to invest money in your company and are anxious that you make a success.

Another group is your grower-public who, as I have said, live in your backyard. In this respect our industry is a peculiar one in that we live right with our growers.

The consumer-public is the one who tells us whether or not we are suc-

fact that they understand what we have to tell them only after continual repetition in order to get the story across. If that doesn't happen, there is something wrong with doing good or telling about it.

Doing good is a basic policy that can be carried out by employees. How can you communicate your story to your folks, what are some of the more common media of communication? There are several of them, but we will look at some of the simpler ones.

The best one, of course, is personal contact. Talk face to face with the fellow and be sure he understands what you are doing. Group meetings are an excellent way of getting your story across.

Other media are company publications such as the annual report. Employee publications are mailed once a month to the home of each employee so the entire family can read them. These publications tell about the company's policies, operations and plans. Also send these to community leaders, the state officials, clergy, superintendent of schools etc. The canning industry has a large amount of information which is of interest to the average reader.

Plant-tours are an excellent way of telling our story. We have a new policy in plant-tours which has demonstrated its worth. Rather than wait for someone to visit, we extend the invitation to them. This has the plus value in that you can control the people coming. In our plant-tour program we like to have basically three points: Indoctrinate them and acquaint them with the company's background; have the tour based on what their interests are; invite them to go to the company kitchen for refreshment of some kind and allow them to ask questions. When they leave they have generally had a story about the company and these three steps have tremendous value. Our plant-tour program has more than trebled in some areas.

Exhibits and films may also be used. Community participation on the part of employees is an excellent way of getting the story across. The employee must first be fortified with information so that during his participation he can tell his friends about the company. In the past two or three years we have encouraged our employees in the activities of their communities and recognition has been given. We have created interest on the part of our employees in schools, youth activities, etc., which has paid off tremendously.

Public relations are fine but it is something you cannot buy. Who is responsible for good public relations? Who can I get to do the job for me? The answer is simply that the guy who is going to do the job is no one else but you—you are the person who has to do it. Simply, public relations is just being a regular fellow.

Canner-Grower Relations—Canner Viewpoint

By R. H. Winters,
The Larsen Company

To paraphrase one of television's popular programs—"We want the facts, Mam." "Just give us the facts." Then let us face the facts. Our business is based on agriculture. It is deeply rooted in agriculture. We processors need the farmers more than they need us. This being the case, the grower's importance to us is deserving of a well-planned and organized program aimed at earning his confidence, cooperation, and good will.

Such a program we refer to as one of canner-grower relations. It is but one phase of our public relations. Public relations could be defined as those impressions, gained by the public at large, through each and every daily contact between all segments of the public and our business. Similarly then, canner-grower relations are established with each and every act or contact established between the grower and the canner including all canner representatives. Through each contact we add or subtract good will, prestige, and confidence. There is no such thing as a current need for better or improved grower-canner relations. If there is such a need, then it follows that past relations have not been good, and we are now confronted with a need to "mend the dykes"—to make amends for the past, to turn over a new leaf.

Improper grower relations, like poor employee relations, bring about the need for collective activity or, rather, collective bargaining. Collectively, the combined economic weight of organized growers becomes a better match for the superior bargaining position of the corporation. How, then, if this comes about can we expect fair treatment at the bargaining table if we have through short-sightedness not in the past accorded individual growers fair and equal consideration?

It is gratifying that our National Cannery Association is taking leadership in emphasizing to its membership the importance of a "canner's relationship to agriculture." Far too many canners have ignored the subject, others have but professed an interest, but many canners have established enlightened, progressive programs whereby they recognize their interdependence with the farm community in which they operate. In so doing, they have made great strides in furthering the economic progress of their companies.

We, in The Larsen Company, like to think of ourselves in this latter group.

Carlos and Charlie Mahoney asked that this discussion be pointed not entirely to the mechanics of an enlightened, effective, practical, agricultural relationship, but rather to cite

the experiences of The Larsen Company as a smaller canner, deeply concerned with its relationship to agriculture as a whole and specifically in its immediate community.

Perhaps a few words about The Larsen Company would help. It is one of the two oldest independent canning companies in Wisconsin. It was founded in 1890 at Green Bay as the William Larsen Canning Company. Three plants are now operated—at Green Bay and Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin, and Kent City, Michigan. We are exclusively vegetable packers. Raw products utilized include spinach, peas, green beans, lima beans, sweet corn, beets, carrots, potatoes and celery. Our volume requires the production from over 15,000 acres of land and has an annual value approximating \$3,000,000. Annual sales of the company are about \$10,000,000. We maintain canner-grower relationship with over 2,000 individual farm producers. We well remember years ago when our acreage requirements were relatively much smaller, and such acreage was hard to contract. Today, acreage is reasonably plentiful, even with increased needs. Now no new land has been brought into production. Canning crops under the terms and conditions of former years just were not wanted. It is a different picture, for today we are able to select our growers from a waiting list of farmers desiring canning or cash crops.

Just how, when and why has this come about?

(1) Why? The answer was in part necessity. Yet simultaneously a personnel change came about. With Milton W. Larsen and his associates, a program of public and grower relations was undertaken.

(2) When? About 20 years ago policies pertaining to growers were then advanced and applied that were considered by some to be "left of center." Those who advocated such were classed just a little radical.

(3) How? By following a policy laid down not 20 years ago, but 2,000 years ago. Yes, such a policy then was, in today's language, "left of center." That policy can be found in your New Testament. See Matthew 7-12. It is referred to as the "Golden Rule."

It takes two keys to open your safe deposit box. There are two keys to good canner-grower relations.

(1) A well-formulated and thoroughly understood agricultural policy—understood by the canners representatives and the growers alike. Make it your bible and live by it!

(2) A competent field staff to maintain cordial relations with growers, treating them all alike and impartially.

Field men should show an interest in the grower's over-all general prob-

lems; he must be informed so he can discuss with the grower these problems in an intelligent manner, and frequently, because of his wide agricultural contacts, be able to make informed and intelligent suggestions for the handling of problems other than those directly related to canning crops.

The matter of contracts and the fulfillment of contractual obligations are most important in any canner-grower relationship. Let me emphasize that the contract must reflect the company's agricultural policy: it must be legally correct; its terms or phraseology must be plain and understandable to the grower. The contract and all its provisions must be subjected to annual review and revision to reflect current conditions. Prices are an important part of contracts; they must return to the grower a fair compensation for the use of his land and his labors, and, in general, must compete with other commodities.

Omit, insofar as possible, minor charges or, rather, deductions that can be irritating to the grower. In the line of services that are provided, be sure that the grower is aware of the importance to him of the services which you provide and the value of these services, particularly the cost of providing them for his use. Inform him of the individual costs of special harvesting, loading equipment, and the total amount thereof necessary to provide such services to all growers. Do not hide under a bushel basket the value of soil testing, certified seed, inoculation, equipment for insecticidal applications, etc. Out of sight has been frequently referred to as out of mind.

Keep your name and that of your company constantly before your growers. Direct mailing, which provides them with information on pertinent subjects, is very effective. Such material need not necessarily be confined to canning crops. Send illustrated booklets or bulletins on agricultural practices; teach them to expect a grower letter published at periodic intervals carrying to them current information on crops to be planted, now growing, or just harvested. If average yields and grower returns can be pointed to with pride, do not fail to do so. A letter from your company packed with good information is looked forward to and carefully preserved. Government, university and other institutions provide a wealth of information that can be used in furthering your direct mailing program.

Do you maintain friendly relations with your county agents and see that they are provided with correct information with respect to current crop returns and crop conditions? Are you taking an active interest in county fairs, displaying your products, working with 4-H Clubs, Future Farmers of America, and Future Homemakers of America? Your genuine interest in the agricultural community can

well be reflected by the part you play in agricultural activities within the area within which you operate. In other words, the most effective means of obtaining favorable publicity is not by seeking it out or through the publishing of paid advertising, but by doing things that make news and are to the genuine interest of the public, and particularly, your growers.

Who among you can deny that agriculture is the very foundation of the canning business? Then are not your farmers but commissioned employees in your production department, the same as a good broker is to your sales department? Do you handle your farmer as such? Remember, his only justifiable purpose in growing canning crops is for a fair profit with fair

treatment. Your failure to provide a fair return in line with competitive crops and accord "Mr. Grower's" understanding and consideration will place you 100 percent in the farming business.

There is sufficient risk in the canning business alone, without our adding this additional hazard. Sound grower-canner relations require an adequate and trained field personnel, adequate to provide timely crop advice and service, and trained in human relations as well as agricultural practices, thus to promote harmonious, pleasant business relations, and trained well in your agricultural policy, which by all odds, your field men should have participated in the formulation thereof.

Canner-Grower Relations—Grower Viewpoint

By Lee Towson,
Past President, Vegetable
Growers Association of America

I am here to discuss canner-grower relations from the standpoint of the grower. I have prepared what I consider to be a number of important principles and have discussed them in detail with a number of growers before coming to this meeting.

I should like to read you a resolution passed by the Vegetable Growers Association of America at its meeting last December. This states:

"8. Grower-Processor Relations

"The production and processing of vegetables, now a highly specialized industry, owes its rapid growth to the consumer's desire for convenience, quality, uniformity, and appearance, all at a reasonable cost. Continued improvement of the techniques of production, as well as processing and distribution, is a common responsibility of both grower and processor. Both desire a more stable volume of quality vegetables for the processor so as to increase the efficiency of the processing plant, and an attractive market for the carefully planned and grown vegetables of the producer. Processors should assume more responsibility in the development of mutually profitable vegetable crop processes.

"We invite the National Canners Association and State Canner Associations to join us actively in establishing this program as a permanent undertaking."

Any processor-grower relationship should be of mutual interest. The processor must be an efficient marketing agent, and the grower must recognize the processor as a good means of marketing.

The program must be profitable to both processor and grower. Under average conditions the grower must make a profit or friction will develop. Because of this fact many unhappy relationships have resulted between

canner and grower. It should be borne in mind that if this unhappy relationship were to continue, growers might apply to the U. S. Department of Agriculture to set up rules and regulations to assist grower organizations in negotiating with processors. If the growers can show a definite need, this is likely to happen; this is particularly true with crops such as fruit.

Inasmuch as the grower and processor are human beings, the relationship between them, although on a business basis, must be humane. The processor should be on a friendly and sound relationship with his growers. He must be acquainted with the farmer's viewpoint. Through understanding of each other's problems, better quality will be achieved and at less waste.

Some canners pay more for high quality raw products than for field run and this is an inducement for the good grower to produce high quality. The grower is the "president" of his own farm organization but too often he is unable to meet the president or principal officers of the canning organization. The grower feels that he should have the privilege, on occasion, to meet and discuss mutual problems with the officials of the canning company.

The grower must be shown that net income depends on efficiency in production and yield, as well as on raw material price. Through the use of new methods and new machinery, the canner must assist his growers so that they can, in turn, help the canner be competitive. This can be done at no cost to the grower.

The processor must have the most up-to-date information and know as much as the grower, or more, about growing the crop. He also must appreciate that economic and biologic requirements of certain crops are more technical and more exacting than those of processing itself. It is particularly important that the proc-

essor and his staff supply up-to-date information in dealing with new growers.

This information must be extended to the grower by a qualified and experienced field man, sufficiently well informed that his judgment will command the respect of growers.

The processor's field man must render services continually during the growing season. He must show interest in the growers' problems and in the progress of the growers' crops. We feel that the canner and his field staff should interest themselves in agricultural organizations and participate even to the extent of entering specialized projects, such as the Future Farmers of America and the 4-H Club groups, and participating in extension service meetings within the county. The canner and his staff also should be interested in conservation practices for the area in which he operates.

Fertility standards for each crop for each processor's area are important. General recommendations pertaining to fertility and fertility practices are insufficient. The canner should have an agricultural department or an agricultural research division to test, on a pilot plant scale, the most adaptable crop varieties and the most practical and most economic weed control practices, the best insecticides, and specific fertility recommendations based upon actual soil tests before recommending any of these practices to his growers.

University and college recommendations as given out at canners' schools must be translated into the solution of problems of the grower during his production season. A picture is said to be worth a thousand words. Statistical charts which are simple and accurate can be very effective in presenting ideas to growers, particularly in relation to income from canning crops as compared with other farm crops.

The processor's director of procurement must have technical and economic information on farm crops other than the processing crops, so as to help the grower have a balanced program. Newsletters which are informative and accurate and which are issued at regular intervals are extremely helpful in keeping the grower acquainted with new developments in agriculture or on developments of company policy.

A large turnover in growers shows a poorly developed program of procurement and relationship. In this connection, wide fluctuations from year to year in acreage requirements are very undesirable.

The processor must tell the story of his industry as to cost and profit, showing the amount of his investment, and that it is a volume business. We don't believe that there is an advantage in hiding facts on company

operations. The annual reports of many companies are published and an explanation of them by the canner to the grower would be very helpful. We feel that the processor's business is based on agriculture; and if the canner wishes to have the confidence of his growers, it should be based on the knowledge that the processor is operating a profitable and expanding business. To obtain acreage contracts by subsidy or indirect bribery is very poor practice.

The grower and processor should jointly realize that their boss is the consumer. She must be satisfied. The grower should be made to realize this, through information from the processor. We feel that the processor should keep canned vegetables a good buy and, through advertising and promotion, he should stimulate an increase in the per capita consumption of these canned foods.

Both the processor and the grower have an interest in the product until the consumer rings the cash register and is satisfied. Remember that the

grower's wife also is part of the team and that she also is a consumer; and she should be able to take pride in the product which the canner is packing from her farm.

Contracts between grower and processor must be as complete, specific, and as short as possible. Each of the parties to the contract should have equal weight. At the national level, growers are concerned about the apparent different regional prices being paid for raw products. We realize that purchases are made on different bases in different parts of the country, some being based on field run grade, whereas other prices are based on quality differences. We believe that the National Canners Association should make an effort to interpret these differences in price on the basis of the difference in the type of the raw product being purchased. If this could be done, we believe it would eliminate a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding on the part of growers as to the activities of canners in different parts of the country.

A Report on the Raw Products Emphasis Currently Being Placed in the Consumer and Trade Relations Program

By George Anderson,
Dudley, Anderson & Yutzy

The formal title of our paper today is "A Report on the Raw Products Emphasis Currently Being Placed in the Consumer and Trade Relations Program." Perhaps a better one would be "As Ye Sow So Shall Ye Reap."

In discussing the addition of raw product emphasis for the coming year the time might be appropriate to re-examine the reasons and objectives of the Consumer and Trade Relations program over-all. Although in naming it a Consumer and Trade Relations program, we have deliberately described its functions—it is still a public relations program in the true sense.

And whether you know it or not—whether you like it or not—you have public relations. You just can't not have public relations because public relations is, in essence, the attitude of the public toward your product. This attitude may be good, bad or indifferent. But it must be one of the three. If it's good, that attitude must be maintained. If bad, the reasons must be sought and corrected. If indifferent, the virtues of your product which warrant interest and appreciation must be made public knowledge.

In today's highly competitive food business no industry can afford an indifferent public attitude toward its products, much less an unfavorable one simply because we're competing with at least 5,000 other food and non-food items in the average supermarket.

Usually when an industry embarks upon a public relations program it sets out consciously to correct wrong impressions or indifference on the part of the public and to replace such attitudes with favorable impressions. This must be done by translating the industry's products into themes that will be meaningful to consumers and which will impress them favorably with the industry's philosophy and performance. Such themes incorporate basic ideas and ideals which are appreciated by the American public.

Here are just a few that I'm sure you'll recognize:

"She's Lovely, She's Engaged, She Uses Ponds"—a way to sell glamor. "Progress Is Our Most Important Product"—General Electric's way of selling prestige. "Good To The Last Drop"—The Maxwell House approach to flavor. "99 44/100% Pure"—Ivory Soap's definition of quality.

If themes sell goods, then let's look at the basic editorial themes that were highlighted in the Consumer and Trade Relations program last year:

"Because of Canned Foods We Eat Better Today" (*Woman's Home Companion*). "Entertain Wonderfully With Dinners From Cans" (*American Weekly*). "How Fresh Is Fresh?" (*McCall's*). "Teen Cooks Love Canned Foods" (*Seventeen*). "Canned Foods For Better Family Meals" (*Parents*).

These themes which concentrated on prestige and glamor also included references to all of the basic advantages of canned foods—quality, convenience, economy, availability, ease of handling and storage, variety and versatility.

As the N.C.A. Consumer and Trade Relations program has progressed it is gaining national attention. Your baby is growing up. As a matter of fact, some of the experts outside our own canning industry are telling us why the program was formed in the first place. In the face of the experts, it has been the steadfast belief and approach of N.C.A. and D.A.Y. that your program is not one that competes with fresh or frozen foods. It was not born of competition or desperation. Perhaps it was best dedicated by Carlos Campbell himself in this article that appeared in the *Journal of Commerce* on April 28. If I may, I'd like to quote a few paragraphs for you:

"The canning industry, over the years, has prided itself on the fact that canned foods to the consumer have risen less rapidly than most other foods. In fact, canned foods have become so closely identified with that type of price pattern that it could well be said the industry has 'hitched its wagon to a low-priced star.' This general consumer price pattern has been maintained by canners even in the face of rising costs of cans and other supplies, sizable advances in costs of the raw product and major increases in wages paid to labor.

"Costs Factors

"In a highly integrated industry such as canning, savings achieved through low unit cost production can be passed on to the consumer in the form of reasonable prices only by maintaining a level of production per factory unit that will provide the most efficient use of management, labor and physical equipment involved in a highly mechanized operation.

"Consequently, it became apparent a few years ago that the industry had to elect one of two courses of action: (1) to succumb to the pressure of steadily increasing costs, with the obvious result that such increases would be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher canned food prices, or (2) to fight to maintain the hard-won reputation which canned foods had achieved throughout the years. The industry has elected to follow the latter course, which led to the inauguration of a program designed to expand consumption, even beyond the normally favorable increases of recent years."

The key, then, is the desire to maintain our hard-won reputation for quality at reasonable prices by expanding consumption beyond the normally favorable increases of recent years.

How is this objective being accomplished? By the consistent and constant development of the themes which will increase the sale of canned foods to the consumer—and by presenting to the consumer in imaginative terms the fundamental activities of the canning industry and the thoughtfulness and care you put into product production. We've talked about the

themes of glamor and prestige that hallmarked the program last year and will continue. We now think that it's time to add to the program the raw products research story, translating as scientific a subject as research into themes that consumers will understand and that will further add to consumer appreciation of canned foods as a whole.

We feel it is important to get the raw products story over to the consumer for three reasons:

First, whether you realize it or not, a lot of consumers are of the opinion that our industry uses low grade products for canning. You might say we use the leftovers of fresh. We must get that out of their heads.

Second, we must convince the consumer that not only does the canning industry process products of highest quality, but through raw products research is constantly at work making them better than the best.

Third, we must point out in the raw products research program that the canning industry recognizes the importance of protection even from field to factory. We do not allow the original raw product to remain at the mercy of gradual deterioration from farm or orchard to table. We seal in flavor and quality and hold it until the time of consumption.

Here's a mass display of what we're selling. Have you ever tried to sell a can of research? That's what we're doing right now. What housewife cares about fertilizers and insecticides and plant breeding, you may ask. And you're right if you say, "probably none."

That's where our job begins. It's up to us to interpret and explain raw products research in terms of what the housewife does care about—flavor, quality, economy, nutrition, convenience, year-round availability and all of the other advantages for which canned foods are known.

Let's open a can of research and see what's inside.

Cherry Floats—Tanks of water now carry cherries from field to cannery to prevent bruising of the fruit. A typical example of the care taken by canners to produce and maintain top quality in canned foods.

Hormones in Pineapple Land—In pineapple growing a successful crop is guaranteed by scientific methods of growing and cultivation which includes hormone sprays. The end result is Hawaiian glamor on the tables of America . . . available all year, every year.

Tomatoes Eat Better Than People—The balanced diets which canners have developed for tomatoes have doubled the yield and resulted in higher quality . . . making tomato growing possible under varying soil conditions in many areas of the country. Widespread availability of the raw product means plenty of canned tomatoes

always available to consumers at a reasonable price.

Tender Hearted Peas—Because of the development of the tenderometer, canners know the precise moment of peak flavor and maturity for picking peas. Consumers can now buy sweeter, more tender peas when they buy them canned.

Air Conditioned Peas—The controlled temperature and humidity under which Bartlett pears are ripened permits greater efficiency in handling and processing, makes more fruit available to consumers at lower cost.

The Well-Bred Corn Family—Because of a continuing program of in-breeding and crossbreeding of corn, consumers get a tenderer, sweeter, better colored product.

Oxygen Tents For Apples—Artificial maturing of apples by storage in oxygen and carbon dioxide may make it possible to level out demands on canning facilities, produce a higher yield, and offer a higher quality and more economical product to consumers.

Green Beans Go Straight—Controlled irrigation ensures straight podded beans with less fiber. Regulating moisture in the soil also increases the yield. Consumers benefit in many ways: they get more tender succulent beans, more attractive and at a reasonable price.

Corn Machinations—Harvest by machine means quick, efficient gathering of the crop. By solving the problem of a potential labor shortage which might have curtailed production the industry is able to assure consumers of the ready and consistent availability of this popular canned vegetable at a very reasonable price.

Beauty Rest For Fruit Buds—If fundamental research on this problem proves successful, terminal buds treated with hormones will retard budding until danger of frost is past. By discovering a method to prevent losses from freezing, canners will take another big step toward providing consumers with the best quality products at the lowest possible cost.

Each of these themes offers a new approach to the basic canning industry story—the story of flavor, quality, convenience, economy and nutrition. They provide new leads which will be highly acceptable to the editorial staffs of national magazines, Sunday supplements, daily newspapers, radio and television programs.

They also provide an opportunity for creating special projects in cooperation with groups such as 4-H Clubs, Junior Vegetable Growers of America, Future Farmers and Future Homemakers of America. They will be incorporated in the television film which is now in production; in special recorded interviews for radio featuring prominent people like Secretary of Agriculture Benson, which is also in the works, and in many special events which will be reported to you as they develop.

In short, this is the way we hope to interpret the canning industry to the consuming public—by translating its activities into themes which the consumer understands and appreciates. In the raw products research story we have a splendid opportunity to sell not only canned foods but canners themselves to the consumers of the nation. Incidentally, the raw products program is not substituting for the current program—it is in addition to it.

Now at the end of any report of this kind which involves props it is customary to give credit to those responsible. Therefore, cans are through the courtesy of N.C.A. and the American Can Company. The display itself through the courtesy of Fred van Horsten of N.C.A. The can opener through the courtesy of the Cahill Manufacturing Co. The microphone courtesy of Westinghouse. Miss Ricky Gieseler courtesy of Bell Model Service. Technical advice courtesy of Dr. Campbell and Dr. Mahoney.

Summary of Address

By Charles B. Shuman,
President, American
Farm Bureau Federation

Farmers and canners are in partnership in the production of processed fruit and vegetables. Both have an interest in making this partnership work better.

Canners, of course, represent an important market for the products of our farms. We want to improve our relationship with you and to make our partnership even more profitable to both parties.

We feel that canners could do a better job in keeping farmers informed on market changes and on the general problems of the industry.

Growers are entitled to know as much as possible about the supply-and-demand situation of the various canning crops, in order that they can make sound decisions.

Farm Bureau is helping to keep growers well informed by issuing special processing vegetable reports during the active growing season. We appreciate the cooperation of the National Canners Association in supplying us with helpful information for use in these reports.

We recognize that prices are not set either by growers or by processors. The consumer determines the prices of our commodities. Our greatest common interest is in expanding our markets.

We know that satisfactory farm income depends on consumer markets, not on government aids. Our major efforts are devoted to building greater markets, not to getting money from the government.

The commodities which specifically interest you, as canners, are not directly involved in the price support program, but the price support issue concerns you nevertheless.

It concerns you first as Americans interested in the whole direction of our national economy. The route of high rigid price supports, involving what amounts to government price fixing, is the route to a socialized economy.

Variable price supports, advocated by the American Farm Bureau Federation, are designed to keep us on the route of economic, not political, determination of prices and production. This, we are convinced, is the way to better farm income and better standards of living.

As processors of fruits and vegetables you are specifically and directly concerned with the question of diverted acres.

The American Farm Bureau Federation favors restriction on the use of acreage diverted from crops under marketing quotas. Such restrictions would prevent the use of such acreage in competition with fruit and vegetable producers.

This problem of competition from diverted acres is an example of how rigid government price supports, accompanied by controls, affect not only the producers of the supported crops

but other segments of the economy as well.

There are at least four requirements for a really prosperous agriculture: expanding markets, both foreign and domestic, competitive pricing throughout the economy, efficiency of the individual farmer, and a healthy national economy.

Farmers have increased their efficiency some 70 percent in the last 15 years. We have produced the largest volume of farm products in history with the smallest labor force on record.

As farmers strive to reduce their production costs, they must have the cooperation of other groups in attempting to make their products available to consumers at reasonable prices.

Labor, of course, is a major factor on processing and distribution costs. It is encouraging when labor leaders, as they have on occasion, urge members of their organizations to strive for greater production per hour to help lower production costs.

The American Farm Bureau Federation condemns monopoly pricing in business, labor, agriculture and government. If we in agriculture are to continue to emphasize low cost production for a free market, we must insist on free, competitive pricing in industry and labor.

Government has a responsibility to maintain an economic climate in this country which is favorable to expanding consumption, maximum freedom of operation in agriculture and all other business, and preservation of the incentive system which has helped to give this country world leadership.

Nuclear Tests of Canned Foods

By Carlos Campbell

I'm sure that many of you were watching your TV sets on the morning of May 5, when a 35,000 kiloton nuclear explosion went off on the Yucca Flats in Nevada. That was a historic occasion. It was the first time commercially canned foods had ever been exposed to an atomic blast test.

We had 25,000 tin and glass containers of various canned foods in some 15 different localities ranging from as close as a quarter of a mile to three miles from the shot tower. Several of you in the room here contributed samples for this test. The foods represented the major categories, and the selection was based by the joint test organizations (Atomic Energy, Department of Defense, and Federal Civil Defense) on a pattern that would provide the items of widest consumption.

I think we can be proud that canned food tests were considered very important in these tests. The over-all list of foods tested in the blast included staples like flour or sugar; semiperishables, like potatoes, or proc-

essed meats; and perishables such as fresh meats and frozen foods. But certainly canned foods were the most comprehensive, both in quantity and in the number of exposure locations.

(At this point Mr. Campbell indicated on a chart the various exposure locations of the canned foods samples.)

Several different tests were made. In the houses with basements, the foods were stored on shelves in individual packages and in cases both on shelves and on basement floors. Also they were placed in kitchen cabinets and on kitchen shelves. Some of them were buried under two inches of soil so that radioactivity and other factors could be checked later minus blast damage. Some were loosely strewn on the desert floor. Some samples will be tested with animal feedings by Food and Drug for a period running up to two years. The foods in the industrial sheds were on shelves as individual packages and in cases on the floor to simulate conditions in retail and warehouse handling and storage. They are being checked to see how well they resisted blast effects; radioactivity; heat; for retention of

nutrients, and for the possibility of internal changes affecting flavor, odor, or taste.

Along the wall we have mounted photographs that illustrate the different types of exposure both before and after the blast.

We've had a general planning committee working on this project for more than a year and in recent months some of our technologists from both laboratories have been on the scene installing the samples at the various test localities. Some of them are still working out there completing a preliminary report of evaluation of the effects of the May 6 blast. This is a cooperative project. On the committee and on the technical teams that worked in Nevada there are, besides N.C.A. personnel (J. M. Reed, C. P. Collier, C. A. Greenleaf, I. I. Somers), representatives of the Can Manufacturers Institute, the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, and the American Meat Institute.

We had reason to feel pretty confident that canned foods would fare well in this test. Laboratory research already had demonstrated this. But having them exposed at a big public event which FCDA called "Operation Cue" gave us a good opportunity to dramatize before hundreds of observers the performance of canned foods as a safety factor in the event of an atomic emergency. Also it gave us a chance to publicize the fact that canned foods are considered important in what the FCDA was trying to find out; namely, what they should advise the public as to how to prepare food-wise for an atomic emergency. We can't do too much talking yet because all claims have to be cleared by the AEC and FCDA authorities before they are publicized. However, the big public event gave us a prize opportunity to publicize canned foods participation. Our score was pretty good, as reported by Nelson Budd, who handled pre-blast publicity. Canned foods were prominently mentioned in four official press releases issued at Las Vegas to about 500 media representatives—press, radio, TV, magazines, etc.—and we were successful in having two of our press releases distributed on the Las Vegas press tables. This represents more than any one of the 149 other industries involved in the tests. The canning industry's part in the Nevada blast got on three TV networks and in dozens of the stories filed by reporters on the scene, and published all over the country.

The best evidence of our publicity performance is contained in the following statement from *Western Packing News Service*:

"Western canners, in a large number of cases, are going out of their way to comment on the constructive news coverage that canned foods drew in the much-delayed Nevada atomic blast of a simulated community. Can-

ners, who often complain that the basic advantages of canned foods tend to be overlooked by the public in favor of foods with more apparent glamor, seem to have been well pleased by the Nevada coverage, particularly in the text of the stories when the lead started out 'blast postponed, possibly to take place tomorrow.' Curious in the atomic deal was not only the good treatment of canned foods (can be handled roughly, still excellent food after power, lights, refrigeration gone to pot, etc.) but that it also came about in spite of fact that government didn't want anybody to capitalize on the blast, virtually forced the channeling of publicity to Civilian Defense only. Evidence of what canned foods secured seen in fact that canned foods drew more lineage than any other component item sharing in test and there were 63 of them. National Canners Association handling of the situation must have been impeccable since there were some 11 other trade associations participating, none of whom presumably were going out of their way to fight off favorable mentions."

Current Status of Cold Sterilization

By C. A. Greenleaf,
Associate Director,
Washington Research Laboratory,
National Canners Association

Interest in the possibility of cold sterilization of food by means of ionizing radiations has been growing for several years, and the subject has become more complex during that time. There is not time here today to fill in all the details, even if you had the patience to listen to them. All we can do is review briefly some of the background for things you may recently have read on this subject.

In 1951 the Stanford Research Institute reported on an industrial survey it had made for the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission on possible industrial uses for radioactive waste products from atomic fission. Among those reported as promising was cold sterilization of food. The report even went on to speculate as to how this might be done and what it would cost.

Following this the Atomic Energy Commission launched a number of research projects under grants to such places as the University of Michigan, M. I. T., and Columbia University. These included food projects along with engineering applications of various types. In 1953 the food phases of this program were turned over to the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute for the Armed Forces, and the Institute has carried on a large and vigorous program, largely under grants to colleges, universities, or research institutions, since that time. Incidentally, the management of this phase has been in the hands of Dr.

Miss Katherine Smith was able to contact important civil defense officials and has already received invitations to tell the canned foods story at several civil defense meetings.

We will have many future opportunities to publicize canned foods performance under atomic conditions after the officials give clearance to the reports. About all that can be said now is the statement made by Dr. E. P. Laug, the test director, following an inspection of the exposures at 4,700 feet and further distances:

(1) Food products in physically intact packages were found acceptable for use.

(2) Food products as close as 4,700 feet from ground zero were substantially free of radioactivity.

(3) Failure of packages was due principally to gross dislodgment from cupboards or from flying missiles; there was no bursting by blast overpressures.

(4) Generally, foods stored in basements fared better than those on kitchen shelves as far as damage from dislodgment was concerned.

Bruce Morgan, who was hired from the N.C.A. Laboratories by the Food and Container Institute for that purpose.

In the meantime the N.C.A. Laboratories have not remained on the sidelines. We have carried on research for several years on the phase of this subject where it was thought our experience and accumulated information could count for most. This was, in short, determination of the amount of radiation required to destroy the bacteria that we know must be destroyed if canned foods are to keep. We have made very substantial progress in this work and it has been reported fully, both in Laboratory reports and by publication in the scientific press.

We are currently negotiating a contract with the Quartermaster Research and Development Command under which we would undertake a study, along with two of the can company laboratories, of the radiation requirements for destruction of *Clostridium botulinum* in a number of typical canned foods. The plan calls for irradiation and examination of several thousand cans. The radiation will be done in facilities to which the Food and Container Institute has access.

Our own work has been keyed to the destruction of bacteria, yet we know that there is more to food preservation than destruction of bacteria. We know, for example, that in many foods there are enzymes that will cause degenerative changes unless they are inactivated. Heat processing, in the main, destroys enzymes more easily than it does bacteria. With radiation the reverse is true. Perhaps this calls for a combination treatment using some heat and some

radiation, but the details of such a method have not been worked out.

Another problem, and a rather serious one in some cases, is the production of off-flavors and off-odors by radiation. Research is under way on means of overcoming this, and with some success here and there, but there is still a long road to travel.

Another possibility visualized early in the program was that radiation would produce toxic or unwholesome substances in the food. A good deal of research has already been done on this question, and while the story is still far from complete, indications so far point to the absence of such effects.

As more and more people have embarked on investigations in this field, the literature has mushroomed, and there have been repeated meetings and symposia devoted to it. Two such symposia are scheduled for scientific meetings next month. In addition, there have been newspaper stories and magazine articles that made many of us wince when we read them. For the most part we have found the people actually working in this field cautious about predictions for the future, but interpretations given by others have not been so restrained.

On May 9 the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings at which testimony was given by various witnesses from the Army and the AEC. The information presented on irradiation of foods was largely that which has been developing in the research projects referred to earlier, and the manner of presentation was not sensational. Nevertheless it gave rise to published reports that present methods of food preservation will be obsolete in anywhere from two to ten years. It is true that there is justified optimism for use of irradiation, for example to extend the storage life of potatoes and onions and the refrigerator life of meats, to destroy insects in grains, and perhaps other uses. It may be, as some think, possible and practical to irradiate some, perhaps even many, of the canned foods we now sterilize by heat. At the moment there are heavy obstacles in the way of this, and they will not be removed overnight.

A nationally distributed business letter that many of you probably read said recently:

"Atomic radiation to preserve food is making very rapid headway, and threatens to start a revolution in food processing in year or two. Housewives may be able to buy meats, vegetables, fruits, maybe even milk that will keep completely fresh on pantry shelf in air-tight containers.

"Processors of canned and frozen food are genuinely worried . . . lest atomic preservation make a lot of the

existing methods obsolete. Hope to give you more detailed report on this before long."

If this is read a second time, it is seen that the prophecies are watered down with qualifying phrases, "threaten to," "may be able," "maybe". As for processors being worried, they can worry of course if they are inclined that way, but if they are worried that cold sterilization will suddenly and without warning make their plants obsolete, then their worries are needless.

There is no immediate danger of missing the boat. The boat seems to be lying at the wharf, and has enough steam in the boiler to blow the whistle now and then, but as yet not enough to pull away from the wharf.

Cold sterilization should be, and will be, watched carefully, but its prospects are not yet substantial enough to justify drastic changes in plans.

In the meantime, the Association is keeping in close touch with research on cold sterilization, and is kept currently informed of developments. If there is, or promises to be, any major breakthrough of the difficulties still in the way, we are confident that we will learn of it quite promptly, and can advise the industry accordingly.

Canned Baby Food Stocks

Details of the canned baby food supply, stock and shipment situation are reported by the N.C.A. Division of Statistics as follows:

	1954	1955
	(thousands of dozens)	
Canner stocks, Jan. 1.....	65,305	74,083
Pack, Jan.-April.....	44,178	43,233
Supply.....	109,483	117,316
Canner stocks, May 1.....	58,314	66,032
Canner shipments during April	12,539	12,147
Canner shipments, Jan.-April.	51,169	51,284

Stocks of Canned Foods on May 1 and Season Shipments

Reports on canners' stocks and shipments of canned apples, applesauce, RSP cherries, lima beans, beets, carrots, corn, and peas have been issued by the N.C.A. Division of Statistics,

1954 Pack of Sweet Potatoes

The 1954 pack of canned sweet potatoes totaled 3,503,681 actual cases as compared with the 1953 pack of 4,185,911 cases, according to a report by the N.C.A. Division of Statistics.

State	1953	1954
	(actual cases)	
Md., Va., and N. J.....	2,030,832	1,635,333
La., Miss., and Ala.....	1,479,229	1,270,398
Other southern states.....	554,506	387,864
Other states.....	112,344	204,086
U. S. Total.....	4,185,911	3,503,681

Other southern states include Ark., Fla., Ga., N. C., and Tex. Other states include Calif., N. M., and Puerto Rico.

1954 Pack of Catsup

REVISED REPORT

A revised report on the 1954 pack of catsup has been issued by the N.C.A. Division of Statistics. The 1954 pack totaled 18,564,663 actual cases, compared with the 1953 pack of 19,115,503 cases.

With the revision in the pack total, stocks of catsup in canners' hands April 1 amounted to 7,284,262 cases, and shipments from July 1 to April 1 totaled 16,970,992 cases.

Container Size	1953	1954
	(actual cases)	
Glass:		
24/8 oz.....	(a)	(a)
24/12 oz.....	930,763	1,252,503
24/14 oz.....	15,962,025	15,100,603
No. 10 tin.....	2,114,453	1,855,795
Misc. tin and glass....	108,262	355,762
U. S. Total.....	19,115,503	18,564,663

(a) Included in miscellaneous.

and detailed reports covering the May 1 stock and shipment situation have been mailed to packers of these products.

		Canners' Stocks, Season Shipments					
		Total Supply	May 1,		to May 1,		
		1953	1954	1954	1955	1954	1955
		(thousands of cases)					
Apples.....	Carry-over month	*3,120	*4,857	522	1,999	2,599	2,858
Applesauce.....	Aug.	*11,384	*15,720	2,445	5,483	8,938	10,237
RSP cherries.....	July	3,962	3,253	409	347	3,492	2,906
Lima beans.....	Aug.	3,604	4,411	901	1,689	2,703	2,722
Beets.....	July	10,584	9,942	3,012	2,703	7,572	7,239
Carrots.....	July	3,137	3,020	1,237	1,231	1,920	1,780
Corn.....	Aug.	38,562	41,906	10,918	12,752	27,643	29,154
Peas.....	June	34,786	31,488	6,089	3,564	28,696	27,924

* Includes pack from beginning of season to May 1.

Raw Products Publicity

Recent emphasis in the current Consumer and Trade Relations program has been on the many contributions of canning to growers.

A feature story entitled "Canners Change the Landscape," including three illustrations, was recently supplied to 24 farm magazines. It reviewed the practices of canners in their cooperation with seed suppliers, machinery manufacturers and farmers to make agriculture a scientific business. It mentioned the increase in growing areas for vegetables that have been brought about in the past 20 years, the improvement in quality arising from seed development and modernization of farm machinery. The statement is made that "the combination of quality, abundance and economy exists because canners pay close attention to farming problems. They reap a rich, bountiful harvest as a result of careful study of agricultural conditions, and seed, machinery and cultivation methods tailor-made to suit local needs. Farmers who grow crops for canning are assured from the moment they sign their contracts that they will receive all the help and the very best supplies that canners are able to give them."

Similar messages went out in special radio releases also. The matter of benefits derived from crossbreeding and seed selection was made part of a May 17 release in the "Scriptease" series to 67 broadcasters on women's programs with an estimated listening audience of 4,000,000, and the consumer savings achieved by such units as the mechanical bean picker was stressed in a May 18 release in the "Timely Talks" series to 179 broadcasters with an estimated actual listening audience of 11,000,000.

Price Supports

Senator Allen Ellender (La.), chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, announced that hearings on a House approved bill, H. R. 12, to restore rigid price supports on basic crops have been set for June 1.

Chairman Ellender stated that initial hearings will deal primarily with two-price plans and other multiple support price systems for wheat. He further advised that some field hearings will be held to get "grass roots" sentiment, and testimony from farmers "suffering the greatest hardships," as well as from the national farm organizations and the Department of Agriculture.

Mexican Farm Labor Program

The House Committee on Agriculture on May 24 reported a bill, H. R. 3822, extending the authorization for importation of Mexican nationals for employment in agriculture.

The bill would extend this authority until June 30, 1959. This termination date was recommended by the Department of Labor to conform to fiscal year operations.

The Committee stated in its report on the bill that "rather than affording assistance in any way to the wetback Mexican nationals who cross the Rio Grande illegally to seek employment in the United States, or in any way encouraging the practice of employing such Mexicans, this act provides the only effective means of eliminating this practice. With the act in effect, it is to the advantage both of the Mexicans and the employers to utilize the legally controlled procedures of the labor program rather than the illegal practices associated with wetbacks."

As reported, the bill contains several amendments to the present program.

One amendment would relieve employers of double liability for the expense of returning a worker to Mexico once the employer has paid for such movement. This double payment is required now if the Mexican fails to return and is apprehended by immigration authorities.

Title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, which authorizes the present program, provides that the Secretary of Labor must determine and certify that "(1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at such wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers."

H. R. 3822 would specify that the Secretary of Labor shall also obtain information on the availability of domestic workers and the wage rates paid to them from employers and from farmworkers employed in the area where a shortage of domestic workers is reported to exist. The Secretary's determinations with respect to the number of workers to be imported and other relevant information would be posted in public places.

Status of Legislation

Wage-Hour legislation—Senate Labor Subcommittee concluded public hearings May 18 on legislation to amend Fair Labor Standards Act. House Labor Committee will begin public hearings May 31 on legislation to increase the minimum wage; coverage and exemptions will not be considered.

Trade Agreements Act—H. R. 1 was passed by House Feb. 18 and by Senate, with amendments, May 4. Conference met May 18-19 but have not yet scheduled further meetings.

Philippine Trade Act—H. R. 6059 was the subject of a public hearing by the House Ways and Means Committee May 16.

Customs simplification—H. R. 6040 was the subject of public hearings by the House Ways and Means Committee May 23-24.

Mexican farm labor program—H. R. 3822, to authorize continued importation of Mexican nationals for employment in agriculture, was reported, with amendments, by the House Agriculture Committee May 24 (see story, this page).

Price supports—H. R. 12, restoring rigid price supports on basic crops at 90 percent of parity, was passed by House May 5. Senate Agriculture Committee will begin public hearings June 1 on legislation relating to price supports and adjustment (see story, this page).

Trip-leasing—S. 898, to prohibit ICC regulation of the duration of motor carrier leases, will be the subject of public hearings by the Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Surface Transportation beginning June 20.

Renegotiation—H. R. 4904, providing a two-year extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, was passed by House April 28. Senate Finance Committee will hold two days of public hearings at a date to be determined.

Hells Canyon Dam—Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation will vote June 1 on S. 1333, to authorize construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam. House Interior Subcommittee will hold public hearings June 29-July 1 on bills for federal development of Hells Canyon.

Antitrust suits—H. R. 4954, providing a uniform statute of limitations for antitrust cases, was passed by House April 26.

Antitrust penalties—H. R. 3659, to increase maximum penalties under the Sherman Act, was passed by House March 29.

N.C.A. Files Proposal for Prune Juice Standards

The N.C.A. filed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on May 25 a petition for promulgation of a standard of identity for canned prune juice.

The petition includes a proposed definition for canned prune juice.

Under the Hale amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, if the application is favorably received, the proposal will be published and will form the basis of an order to be published subsequently, establishing the standard in question.

Barring objections leading to a public hearing, the order would become effective 60 days after publication in the *Federal Register*.

Following is the text of the N.C.A. petition:

Petition for Promulgation of a Standard of Identity for Canned Prune Juice

The National Cannery Association, representing a substantial portion of the packers of canned prune juice, on its own behalf and on behalf of its membership, respectfully proposes, in accordance with the procedure established by Section 401 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, that a new section 27.50 be added to the regulations under the Act to provide a standard of identity for canned prune juice.

The basis of this petition is an expressed desire by a substantial portion of the canned prune juice industry that a standard be promulgated.

A draft of the proposed section 27.50 of the regulations providing a standard of identity for canned prune juice is attached.

There are also attached to this petition exhibits containing evidence supporting the proposal and showing reasonable grounds therefor.

This petition for a standard for canned prune juice is being filed with the express understanding that it will not preclude consideration of any proposal for amendment of the standard to provide for a product to be called canned prune juice and to be made from the juice of the fresh Italian plum, when and if such a product is placed on the market.

Respectfully submitted,

National Cannery Association
CARLOS CAMPBELL,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

PROPOSED DEFINITION FOR CANNED PRUNE JUICE

Section 27.50. *Canned prune juice; identity; label statement of optional ingredients.*

(a) Canned prune juice is the food prepared from the water extract of dried prunes and contains not less than 18.0 percent by weight of soluble solids derived from dried prunes. Such food may contain one or more of the optional sweetening ingredients specified in paragraph (b) of this section and one or more of the acidulants specified in paragraph (c) of this section. Such food is sealed in a container and so processed by heat as to prevent spoilage.

(b) The optional sweetening ingredients referred to in paragraph (a) of this section are:

- (1) Sugar.
- (2) Invert sugar sirup.
- (3) Corn sirup, dried corn sirup or glucose sirup.
- (4) Dextrose.
- (5) Honey.

The amount of optional sweetening ingredient or ingredients or any combination thereof that may be added to prune juice containing not less than 18.0 percent by weight of soluble solids derived from dried prunes, shall not exceed 5.0 percent by weight in the final product.

(c) The optional acidulants referred to in paragraph (a) of this section are:

- (1) Lemon juice.
- (2) Lime juice.
- (3) Citric acid.
- (4) Lactic acid.
- (5) Malic acid.
- (6) Tartaric acid.

The amount of optional acidulant or any combination of two or more of these acidulants that may be added to prune juice containing not less than 18.0 percent by weight of soluble solids derived from dried prunes shall be that quantity which is necessary for flavoring.

(d) For purposes of this section:

- (1) The weight of any optional ingredient means the weight of the solids of such ingredient.
- (2) The term "sugar" means refined sugar (sucrose).
- (3) The term "invert sugar sirup" means a sirup made by inverting or partly inverting sugar or partly refined sugar; its ash content is not more than 0.3 percent of its solids content, but if it is made from partly refined sugar, color and flavor other than sweetness are removed.

(4) The term "corn sirup" means refined corn sirup (including dried corn sirup) the solids of which contain not less than 40 percent by weight of reducing sugars calculated as anhydrous dextrose.

(5) The term "glucose sirup" means a sirup which conforms to the definition in this subparagraph for corn sirup except that it is made from any edible starch.

(6) The term "dextrose" means refined anhydrous or hydrated dextrose made from any starch.

(7) The term "honey" means the sirup which is formed by natural processes from nectar gathered by bees and which has been separated from the comb by centrifugal force, gravity, straining or by other means.

(e) The label shall bear the name "Prune Juice—A Water Extract of Dried Prunes." When any optional ingredient or ingredients permitted by paragraph (b) of this section is or are used the label shall bear the name or names of the component or components in order of predominance, if any, of the weight of such components. Such name or names shall be preceded by the words "Sweetened With." When any optional ingredient or ingredients permitted by paragraph (c) of this section is or are used the label shall bear the name or names of the component or components in order of predominance, if any, of the weight of such components. Such name or names shall be preceded by the words "Flavored With."

Wherever the name "Prune Juice—A Water Extract of Dried Prunes" appears on the label so conspicuously as to be easily seen under customary conditions of purchase, the words specified in this section showing the optional sweetening ingredients and/or flavoring ingredients used shall immediately and conspicuously follow such name without intervening written, printed or graphic matter.

W. S. Everts

W. S. Everts, 67, retired vice president of the Cannery League of California, died May 20 in Oakland, Calif.

Major Everts was associated with the canning industry from 1927, when he left the U. S. Army, until his retirement in 1953.

He was assistant secretary of the League for many years and in 1943 was elected vice president.

His work with the League was concerned largely with raw products problems and marketing programs. He also worked closely with the University of California on canning crop problems and development of new varieties.

For many years Major Everts was manager of the Cling Peach Advisory Board. He also was manager of the Asparagus Advisory Board in the years when there was a program.

Constitutionality of Trade Act

The constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act is challenged in a protest filed on behalf of the tuna canning industry May 26 with the Collector of Customs in New York City.

The protest challenges the Act as an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power to the President, because the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to fix taxes and duties and that the President may make treaties only with the consent of the Senate.

Counsel for the tuna canners expect to have the case heard by the U. S. Customs Court at an early date and plan to carry the case to the Supreme Court if necessary.

If the position of the tuna canners is supported in the courts, all tariff rates negotiated under the reciprocal trade agreements program would be considered invalid and the rates of duty on all imported merchandise presumably would be those established by the Tariff Act of 1930.

Another suit challenging the constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act was filed by the glass industry in a U. S. District Court March 1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
Association Activities		Congress	
Directors give attention to canners' relationship with agriculture	219	Price supports	228
Canner-Grower Relations from the Public Relations Point of view, by Paul Benson	220	Mexican farm labor program	228
Canner-Grower Relations—Canner Viewpoint, by R. H. Winters	221	Status of legislation	228
Canner-Grower Relations—Grower Viewpoint, by Lee Towson	222	Consumer and Trade Relations	
A Report on the Raw Products Emphasis Currently Being Placed in the Consumer and Trade Relations Program, by George Anderson	223	Raw products publicity	228
Summary of Address, by Charles B. Shuman	225	Death	
Nuclear Tests of Canned Foods, by Carlos Campbell	225	W. S. Everts	229
Current Status of Cold Sterilization, by C. A. Greenleaf	226	Foreign Trade	
		Constitutionality of trade act	230
		Publicity	
		National radio show features canned foods	219
		Raw Products	
		Drosophila control	219
		Standards	
		N.C.A. files proposal for prune juice standards	229
		Statistics	
		Canned baby food stocks	227
		Stocks of canned foods on May 1 and season shipments	227
		1954 pack of sweet potatoes	227
		1954 pack of catsup	227